

Application No. 10/613,328
Attorney Docket No.: 071174
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is herein amended.
No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-14, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paukshto**, *Two Novel Applications of Thin-Film E-Type Polarizers*, SID 02 Digest, pp. 722-725 (2002), in view of **Ignatov**, *Thin Crystal Film Polarizers and Retarders*, Conference: Liquid Crystal Materials, Devices, and Applications VIII (2002), and further in view of **Suzuki** (U.S. 2002/0089621); claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paukshto** in view of **Ignatov** and further in view of **Kurtz** (U.S. 2005/0151905); claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paukshto** in view of **Ignatov** and **Kurtz** and further in view of **Suzuki**; claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paukshto** in view of **Ignatov** and further in view of **Lazarev**, *E-type Polarizers and Retarders*, Proceedings of SPIE, vol. 4819, pp. 46-55 (2002); and claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paukshto** in view of **Ignatov** and further in view of **Kaneko** (U.S. 2002/0145689).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the direction of the liquid crystal directors coincide with an off-normal viewing direction in the range of an azimuth angle of from 15 to 35 degrees in the voltage-on state and the contrast becomes the largest in such direction. Support for the amendment is in Figs. 8 and 9 and in the specification, pages 16 to 17.

Application No. 10/613,328
Attorney Docket No.: 071174
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Applicants respectfully submit that Paukshto in view of Ignatov and further in view of Suzuki does not teach or suggest:

wherein the direction of the liquid crystal directors coincides with an off-normal viewing direction in the range of an azimuth angle of from 15 to 35 degrees in the voltage-on state and the contrast becomes the largest in such a direction

as recited in amended claim 1.

Paukshto does not disclose an off-normal viewing direction in the range of an azimuth angle of from 15 to 35 degrees. The method of using a display by coinciding the direction of the liquid crystal directors with an off-normal viewing direction in the range of an azimuth angle of from 15 to 35 degrees is neither inherent in the disclosure of Paukshto nor obvious from Paukshto in view of Ignatov and further in view of Suzuki.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and claims 2-5 and 7-23 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-23 is hereby solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No. 10/613,328
Attorney Docket No.: 071174
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Melick', written in a cursive style.

Andrew G. Melick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,868
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp/mra